

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS C. SHRADER,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK GARLAND, et al.,

Respondents.

No. 1:21-cv-01229-AWI-JLT (HC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc. No. 5)

ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT
OF MANDAMUS (Doc. No. 1)

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO
ENTER JUDGMENT AND CLOSE CASE

ORDER DECLINING TO ISSUE
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding in propria persona with a petition for writ of mandamus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1361. On August 17, 2021, the magistrate judge assigned to the case issued findings and recommendations to dismiss the petition. (Doc. No. 5.) These findings and recommendations were served upon all parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty days from the date of service of that order. On September 13, 2021 and September 21, 2021, petitioner filed objections to the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. (Doc. Nos. 6, 7.)

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including petitioner's

1 objections, the court concludes that the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations are
2 supported by the record and proper analysis. Petitioner's objections present no grounds for
3 questioning the magistrate judge's analysis.

4 In addition, the court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner
5 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of
6 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537
7 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate of
8 appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

9 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a district
10 judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the circuit
11 in which the proceeding is held.

12 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the validity
13 of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial a person charged with a
14 criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of such person's detention
15 pending removal proceedings.

16 (c)(1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may
17 not be taken to the court of appeals from—

18 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention
19 complained of arises out of process issued by a State court; or

20 (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.

21 (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the applicant has
22 made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

23 (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue
24 or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

25 If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of
26 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
27 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that
28 "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have
been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve
encouragement to proceed further.'" *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting

1 *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).

2 In the present case, the court finds that petitioner has not made the required substantial
3 showing of the denial of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of
4 appealability. Reasonable jurists would not find the court's determination that petitioner is not
5 entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to
6 proceed further. Thus, the court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

7 Accordingly, the court orders as follows:

- 8 1. The findings and recommendations, filed August 17, 2021 (Doc. No. 5), are
9 ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 10 2. The petition for writ of mandamus is DISMISSED;
- 11 3. The clerk of court is DIRECTED to ENTER JUDGMENT and close the file; and,
- 12 4. The court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

13 This order terminates the action in its entirety.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: October 12, 2021


17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE